REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on October 19, 2006. Claims 1 and 11-17 were pending, and under consideration. The Examiner rejected all claims under consideration. With this amendment, independent claims 1 and 11 are amended and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application.

In making the rejection, the Examiner cited three references: Gruber, Lyons and Golden. The Examiner acknowledged that neither Gruber nor Lyons teach an entityAliasList parameter that has an object that specifies a query of data. To meet this limitation, the Examiner cited the Golden reference. However, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to more specifically point out that the entityAliasList parameter, actually identifies an object that, itself, forms a part of the query of data. Recall that the AdhocQueryCriteria, in one embodiment, allows a user to specify a query in terms of both entities (that is, objects) and individual fields. The entityAliasList parameter allows a user to identify an object either by referring directly to the object, or by referring to an alias for the object. In other words, if the database stores data that is used to populate the "Customer" object (or entity), then the user can use the identity of a "Customer" object in the query itself. The user can also, of course, specify individual fields in addition to entities. The entityAliasList parameter allows the user to identify an object for use as part of the query itself.

This is neither taught nor suggested by Golden. In the rejection, the Examiner specifically cited column 8, lines 45-67 of Golden. This simply states that the user can specify tables in a relational database in a number of different ways. Specifically, Golden states "such specification could be directly by specifying a name or indirectly by specifying what type of query is performed." This simply neither teaches nor suggests that the query, itself, can be formed of an object. Instead, it simply states that a table in the relational database can be specified either directly or indirectly.

By contrast, independent claim 1 has been amended to specifically state that the entity alias list parameter is used in "identifying an object that forms a part of the query of

data...". Since none of the references teach or suggest this, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 11 has been amended to include "an entityAliasList parameter that identifies an object by referring to the object or an alias for the object, the object forming a part of the query of data...". None of the references either teach or suggest that the identity of an object is used as part of the query itself. Further, none of the references either teach or suggest that the identity of the object can be made by referring to the object itself, or by referring to an alias for the object. The Examiner acknowledges that neither Gruber nor Lyons teach this, and Golden only states that tables (not objects) can be part of the query and can be referred to directly or indirectly. Therefore, since these elements of independent claim 11 are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art, Applicant submits that independent claim 11 is allowable as well.

Dependent claims 12-17 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 11. Because independent claim 11 is allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 12-17 are allowable as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 11-17 are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: _____
Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg